

Title, director and release year?

Inequality for all is a 2013 documentary directed by Jacob Kornbluth, focusing on former U.S. Labor Secretary Robert Reich as he examines America's ever widening economic inequality.

What is the central argument or narrative of the film?

The central argument of the film is that economic inequality is in no way benign, and serves to undermine the stability of the U.S. economy as a whole. It's tempting to see inequality as simply "the way things are", but Reich points out that the greatest inequality throughout history, especially American history, has led to instability and collapse.

How is the argument or narrative made and sustained? (Use concrete examples from the film to illustrate.)

Reich makes the argument for his case by showing charts and graphs identifying times of inequality and instability throughout history. Specifically, he shows how before the great depression, inequality was at history highs. He parallels this to today, showing how we are approaching

depression level inequality. The film also shows how growth slows with inequality too, counteracting the argument for “job creators”.

**What sustainability issues did you spot?
Identify and explain each. (Examples -
Political, Legal, Economic, Technological,
Media, Organizational, Educational,
Behavioral, Cultural, Ecological)**

In this film, they identify primarily political and economic sustainability issues but there are cultural ones as well. Politically, the film shows how harmful the Reaganomics of the past few decades have been, and how this isn't sustainable from an economics standpoint. Culturally, they talk about the shift away from the language of “job creation” and advocate for calling it like it really is.

**What parts of the film did you find most
persuasive and/or compelling?**

One of the things I found compelling was a series of segments with Nick Hanauer, and extremely wealthy investor who seems to acknowledge the insanity of the system that has left him with such extensive wealth. He doesn't take credit for anything he's done and remarks on how unfair it is that he doesn't have to pay more taxes.

Does the film have emotional appeal to you? Why? (Use concrete examples from the film to illustrate.)

The film has a little bit of emotional appeal by nature of being about wealth and poverty, but in reality the only emotional appeal is wanting to agree with Robert Reich because he seems sweet and charismatic.

Does the film rely more on science or emotion? (How does the film balance the scientific argument and the emotional argument?)

The film definitely relies mostly on scientific argument, showing charts and trendlines and interviews with experts. The film is hardly emotional at all and the tenor of it is generally lighthearted but matter of fact and it seems to progress quickly.

Does the film want you to do something?

If the film does suggest action, do you think it is a good idea? Will the suggested action help?

The action Robert Reich suggests is sort of wishy-washy. He talks about “being a leader in your community”, but doesn’t really explain how that helps. Some students after the film explain how they were inspired to take a different career path which is cool. The film in its closing titles also suggests some resources for learning more which could help.

Are there other actions that are not suggested that should be taken?

I think one thing people can do is speak up to combat bad ideas, and write to their congresspeople to try and make their voice heard. As business owners people should try and avoid bad practice and support the wellbeing of all workers.

What was the target audience for this film? Why?

I think the target audience was probably college age people, probably people who would have their perspective altered but in reality it is probably most watched by liberals for whom this is “preaching to the choir”.